

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Holliday
From: Karen Dodd, Commissioner's Delivery Unit
Date: March 8, 2013
Subject: Bi-monthly Memo for College and Career Readiness Delivery Plan

OVERVIEW

It is highly likely that we are on target to meet or exceed the 2012-13 CCR goal. This outcome mostly will stem from implementation of the new accountability model. Attributing any portion of CCR rate increases to specific programmatic activities is extremely constrained due to limited data, and in some cases confounded data. Our proposed work with ARCC would help to resolve a lot of the data issues.

This summer we will receive graduation results for the 2011-12 graduating class and the 2012-13 graduating class. The 2011-12 results will be calculated using AFGR. The 2012-13 results will be calculated using AFGR and the 4-year cohort graduation rate. It is likely that we are on target to meet or exceed the delivery targets for both years based on preliminary data.

OVERALL LIKELIHOOD OF DELIVERY

Strategy	Mar '12	May '12	Jul '12	Oct '12	Dec '12	Mar '13
Collection & Use of Data: Persistence to Graduation	●	●	●	●	●	●
Course & Assessment Alignment	●	●	●	●	●	●
Unbridled Learning Accountability Model	●	●	●	●	●	●
Targeted Interventions	●	●	●	●	●	●
Career Readiness Pathways	●	●	●	●	●	●
Acceleration – Advanced Placement	●	●	●	●	●	●
Acceleration – Project Lead the Way	●	●	●	●	●	●
Acceleration - Early College Designs	●	●	●	●	●	●
College & Career Advising	●	●	●	●	●	●
Priority Schools	●	●	●	●	●	●

ISSUES AND ACTIONS BEING TAKEN

Collection & Use of Data: Progression to Graduation – Data Usefulness Issues

No impact was expected this year, and no impact can be measured this year regarding use of data to successfully assist districts with identifying students at greater risk for dropout. While the tool has been implemented, the only data available currently are around usage. Additionally, it is not clear how useful the tool is to districts at present. A cross-functional strategy team has been established and they requested approval to administer a survey to districts (DACs, Special Education Co-ops and Instructional Supervisors) in order to identify points of contact and to collect feedback on the updates made to the tool. Survey feedback will inform next steps for better utility. Approval is required by either Dale or

Felicia to send out the survey.

Additional training is needed for districts to highlight the usefulness of the tool and what to do with data when obtained (e.g., information that can be extracted to inform persistence to graduation not only per student but also by student groups).

Making revisions to the tool or creating a new tool is recommended in order to resolve the issues with running PtGT within IC and to answer the questions (a) are indicators already in place in IC useful and sufficient and (b) are certain variables/indicators more predictive than others in persisting to graduation? The tool could also be expanded to include early indicators for meeting performance benchmarks and retention or early dropouts.

Acceleration – Advanced Placement – Budget Issues and Data Issues

Impact may be restricted this year due to sequestration because federal funds covering AP exam fees could be eliminated. Lack of funding may reduce the total number of students taking AP exams, which could affect the ability to measure AP impact accurately. AdvanceKY had agreed to cover exam fees for half of low-income students and ALL of affluent students to increase AP exam taking patterns. KDE should be ready to push AdvanceKY on paying the balance of fees for low-income students, given that this is the population that they are supposed to be targeting for increase. While covering half of the exam fee per low-income students and all of fees for affluent students may not have been problematic originally, this practice may perpetuate inequity in the event of sequestration.

KDE and College Board legal teams are discussing a contract revision to allow access to AP test data within IC, CIITS, and KCEWS. The current contract does not allow KDE to compare AP data to any other competing data (e.g., ACT), but College Board will require additional fees for additional data access. This type of data comparison (AP test scores to ACT test scores) would provide more definitive evidence of AP impact on low-income students. Without such comparison, we still can track enrollment data, but evidence of performance change will be limited.

Acceleration – Project Lead the Way – Scope Concerns

It is understood that due to budget issues, PLTW is being removed as a component of Acceleration. The goal lead would like to track the program's effectiveness, but the Delivery Unit will no longer track it or assess it.

Acceleration – Early College Designs – Scope, Schedule, & Budget Concerns

It is unclear how many schools are using the dual-credit teaching method indicator appropriately. Inappropriate use partly stems from lack of definitions. This makes analysis inaccurate. CPE and Jobs for the Future each have definitions for early/middle college and dual-credit. A decision needs to be made as to which KDE will use.

There is no funding for 2013-2014 for Excellence for All, so there will be no new cohort next school year.

A survey to gather more specific information from participating early college grant schools has been drafted and is awaiting approval. This information was intended to be used to inform the RFA for the cohort 2 schools, which are currently on hold until further notice.

It is also unclear how many students enroll in dual credit. Moving forward, schools will be able to select the drop-down menu for dual credit enrollment in Infinite Campus. Preliminary analysis indicated that this information was not being captured at the state level. Infinite Campus has been notified and is troubleshooting why roster information does not sync to the state edition. This information will be compared to enrollment numbers provided by CPE. Comparison of dual credit data, as well as preliminary enrollment rates from IC, will give a better estimate of participation. Strategy lead is drafting dual-credit specific communication.

College & Career Advising – Unclear Scope and Impact

Currently, the only data available for ILP impact pertains to overall usage. These data indicate no relationship with CCR. In order to demonstrate any impact of ILP, we need more specific data on usage and what components of Career Cruising students are using.

This strategy lacks a mechanism for accountability which prevents the impact of advising to be measured. There is policy in place encouraging the use of advising and legislation requiring that students use the ILP; however, schools are not required to provide advising outside of the ILP.

Ability Profiler was added as a component of Career Cruising, but it is not clear how this will increase CCR rates or what data will be available as a result of including this component.

The strategy analysis plan is being revised around the ILP to become more specific and to allow for more precise analyses of specific components of the ILP used by students. CC Inspire is being implemented and will be key to this effort. In addition, through work with the Cabinet of Workforce Development this component will connect employers in the Commonwealth with students.

Evidence suggests that the connection between advising and use of the ILP could be strengthened. Work is underway to bridge this gap, especially for students enrolled in career pathways. Other activities that will increase the connection between advising and ILP include: adding an advising rubric to ASSIST (January 2013); working to provide principals at Area Technical Centers access to the ILP; and increased PD sessions this January and February to provide training.